

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, Claims 19-24 and 37-72 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 19-24, 43-48 and 67-72 were allowed. Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richards et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,469, hereafter Richards). Claims 40 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Anupam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,139, hereafter Anupam). Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56-60 and 62-66 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; however the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61; and cancels Claims 38, 50, 56 and 62, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 19-24, 37, 39-49, 51-55, 57-61, and 63-72. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Allowed Claims

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 19-24, 43-48 and 67-72 are allowed.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richards (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,469).

Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61 have been amended by the present Response to include the limitations and features of Claims 38, 50, 56 and 60 respectively, which the Examiner had previously indicated as being allowed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment places Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61 in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, Claims 40 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,469) in view of Anupam (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,139).

As described above, Claims 37 and 49 have been amended by the present Response to include the limitations and features of Claims 38 and 50 respectively, and to place those claims in condition for allowance. Since Claims 40 and 52 depend from Claims 37 and 49 respectively, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-described amendment also places Claims 40 and 52 in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Claim Objections / Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56-60 and 62-66 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; however the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61 have been amended as described above to place those claims in condition for allowance. Since Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56-60 and 62-66 ultimately depend from one of Claims 37, 49, 55 and 61, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-described amendment also places Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56-60 and 62-66 in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion


In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2005

By: 

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800